

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:

SUMMARY OF PRIORITIES & ACTION STEPS FOR IMPROVING PE IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

March 2009 version

These policy recommendations for improving physical education (PE) in California were developed by the ASAP team during 2006-2008 and are the culmination of several activities.

- Literature review, summarized in “Physical Activity Matters: PE Matters” brief
- Consideration of the Yancey et al study of PE in California schools, summarized in “Failing Fitness” brief
- Case studies of high quality PE programs achieved by low-resource schools, summarized in “Success Stories From California Low Resource Schools That Have Achieved Excellent PE Programs”
- January 2008 convening of PE and public health professionals who prioritized policy actions to improve PE in California. The convening included facilitated discussion and systematic ratings of policy options.
- Input from ASAP Consultants.

Level 1 policy recommendations are the highest-ranked actions that are relatively low-cost and are expected to work together to create long-term and widespread improvements in PE that would improve the quality of PE. Priority is given to strategies that are most likely to affect childhood obesity.

Level 2 policy recommendations are strongly supported as effective, and several are evidence-based, but they are more costly and less feasible.

Level 3 policy recommendations are lower priority because there is limited evidence to support their effectiveness, their cost is high, or they would do little to reduce disparities in PE quality.

The policies recommended below can also be grouped into policies that support increasing moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA) in PE and those that increase the value of PE as an academic subject. ASAP worked to represent priorities of both the health and education field and, where possible, bring these two together. MVPA related policies have “MVPA” in the top right corner; policies increasing the value of PE have a “VPE” in the top right hand corner. Some policies are related to both strategies.

RECOMMENDED POLICIES TO IMPROVE PE IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

LEVEL 1	MVPA
Policy:	50% MVPA IN PE CLASSES Require all students to participate in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) for at least 50% of PE class time
Current status:	50 % of PE class in MVPA is a target in Healthy People 2010. Only 4-6 out of 30 minutes are spent in MVPA in PE classes in low-resource California public schools, according to Failing Fitness. Students are less active in large classes. Students in lower income schools are less active. Students in elementary schools are less active.
Benefits (health/education/ disparities):	More MVPA during PE generates more energy expenditure and muscular development, contributing to obesity prevention and other physical and mental health benefits. More active classes provide more opportunities for meeting other PE goals such as motor development, increased fitness, skill enhancement, and positive social interactions. More active and fit children tend to have better academic achievement. Requirements for MVPA, if enforced, would greatly improve PE in low-resource schools. To achieve 50% MVPA in PE, classes would require more qualified teachers and smaller class sizes, leading to improved PE in general.
Evidence:	Controlled trials have shown that 50% MVPA can be achieved in PE classes with qualified PE teachers and does not adversely affect academic achievement. MVPA in PE is related to improved fitness levels. A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) demonstrated that increasing MVPA time would be the best strategy to improve activity time in PE, as compared to increasing requirements for PE minutes.
Potential policy steps:	Place responsibility on school districts for ensuring that principals meet the 50% MVPA requirement. Include 50% MVPA as a goal of PE in the California PE framework document.

	<p>Include 50% MVPA in NASPE and other organizations' PE recommendations.</p> <p>Include 50% MVPA in school wellness goals.</p> <p>Educate school boards and principals on the importance of MVPA.</p> <p>Adopt 50% of PE time in MVPA as law. (Although this does not ensure enforcement and may be ineffective without grassroots community support).</p> <p>Adopt regular monitoring (across regions and school SES) and enforcement of MVPA time requirement as law, with meaningful disincentives for violation/non-compliance.</p> <p>Include CA Dept of Public Health in efforts to improve activity in PE.</p>
<i>Relevant research:</i>	<p>Assess the feasibility and costs of objectively evaluating MVPA in schools; e.g., using SOFIT observations, accelerometers, or pedometers.</p> <p>Assess the benefits of increased MVPA time on academic achievement and obesity, especially among students in low income schools.</p>
<i>Costs:</i>	<p>Enforcing a 50% MVPA law would require additional monitoring staff, which could be at the local or state level, these costs may be substantial.</p> <p>Implementing MVPA in classes would involve providing training for PE instructors, especially generalist teachers in elementary schools. To provide 157,339 elementary school teachers with a 3 unit PE course (\$1017 at full CSU tuition) would cost \$160,013,763.</p> <p>CDPH may be able to support more specific training to achieve activity-focused PE at lower cost.</p>
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	<p>Legislature, leading PE and health organizations (e.g. CAHPERD, NASPE, AHA), CA Depts of Public Health & Education, CSBA</p>
<i>Barriers:</i>	<p>Budget cuts are likely to result in reductions in qualified PE teachers in CA.</p> <p>Federal No Child Left Behind law focuses on academic subjects, reducing priority of PE.</p> <p>Lack of perceived importance of PE among education officials and legislators.</p> <p>Cost of implementing monitoring and teacher education, with no source of funds identified.</p>

	<p>Current PE time requirements are not being enforced, so adding more requirements needs to be justified.</p> <p>What precision in measurement is required to ensure compliance?</p>
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<i>“Activity is key”. “PE is active education”. “Learning while moving”.</i>
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Although some groups may argue that the cost of implementing MVPA is substantial and that the monitoring of this is additional burden to an already stretched education system, we believe that the threat of childhood obesity must be addressed by active PE and that the burden can be shared by CA Dept of Public Health. In addition, since the PE content standards do not emphasize MVPA sufficiently, we believe it is key that additional effort is made to prioritize MVPA in PE.</p>

LEVEL 1	VPE
Policy:	<p>PE CONTENT STANDARDS</p> <p>To implement and enforce the required PE content standards in all schools</p>
Benefits (health/education/ disparities):	<p>Content standards provide a benchmark for good PE and ensure appropriate skills and facts are taught.</p> <p>Standards are designed to reflect the state of the discipline and include cognitive and performance elements.</p> <p>Standards give PE a higher standing in the CA Department of Education (CDE).</p>
Current status:	<p>AB 1793 mandated that PE content standards be adopted by 2005 and 10% of schools be monitored annually</p> <p>Implementation of standards is in the beginning stages, with training workshops available. Full implementation is likely to take years.</p> <p>When schools do not meet standards there is no penalty.</p> <p>Assessment of standards implementation is below the required amount due to shortages of expert staff at the CDE.</p>
Evidence:	<p>Introduction of standards in other subjects ensures consistency in the teaching of the subject and accountability against a known benchmark.</p> <p>PE content standards are not systematically based on evidence and have not been evaluated.</p>
Potential policy steps:	<p>Teaching methods for achieving content standards are being formalized in the 2008 PE framework document.</p> <p>Standards based PE curricula need to be developed.</p> <p>There needs to be a central resource to house standards-based curricula materials so teachers can access examples easily.</p> <p>Methods of monitoring and enforcing content standards in schools need to be developed.</p> <p>Integrating 50% MVPA within the PE framework, standards-based curricula, and training programs is required.</p> <p>Include PE assessment in Academic Performance Index, report cards, accreditation processes, awards programs, and school websites.</p>

<i>Relevant research:</i>	<p>How can 50% MVPA be achieved while meeting content standards?</p> <p>How well do existing PE curricula meet the content standards?</p>
<i>Costs:</i>	<p>Enforcing content standards will require additional monitoring staff at local and state level.</p> <p>Costs include training of staff, especially elementary teachers. A content-standards based curriculum would cost about \$40,000,000 to implement K-12, including training.</p> <p>Remediation efforts at the school/district level will incur high costs.</p>
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	CDE, PE teachers, CAHPERD, CSBA
<i>Barriers:</i>	NCLB does not include PE as academic subject.
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<p><i>“PE is an academic subject”</i></p> <p><i>“PE requirements need to be enforced”</i></p>

LEVEL 1	VPE
Policy:	PE LEADERSHIP AT CDE Increasing the staff at CDE to direct PE policies and ensure enforcement
Current status:	Former full time PE leader at CDE, who was a consultant rather than a line staff member, was replaced with a 40% position Previous leadership ensured PE was on the agenda and content standards were developed to give PE academic standing. Limited capability to implement, monitor, and enforce PE requirements.
Benefits (health/education/ disparities):	Direction from CDE sets tone for school districts and individual schools regarding importance of PE and provides needed guidance and support for implementation and enforcement of PE policies
Evidence:	No data available.
Potential policy steps:	Advocate that CDE hire sufficient staff to implement and enforce PE legislation. Encourage CDPH to provide support to CDE for a PE position. CDE needs to be held accountable by the legislature for enforcing PE requirements. Appointment of county & district PE coordinators could support dissemination & monitoring of CDE goals for PE.
Relevant research:	Monitor changes in support for PE with part time staff person. Monitor changes in compliance with PE legislation.
Costs:	Salaries of staff
Stakeholders:	PE teachers, CDE, CDPH, CSBA
Barriers:	Low priority of PE at CDE. Cost.
Campaign focus:	<i>“CDE must take PE seriously”</i> <i>“Good PE has benefits for school culture, concentration, discipline, academic achievement, and health”</i> <i>“PE must assume its rightful place in academia”</i>

LEVEL 1	VPE
<i>Policy:</i>	<p>ACCOUNTABILITY & MONITORING OF PE REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Improve monitoring of all PE requirements and enforce requirements through accountability measures. Main issues are PE minutes and content standards. If MVPA requirements were adopted, they would need to be monitored as well.</p>
<i>Current status</i>	<p>Legislation requires 10% of schools to be monitored annually.</p> <p>Less than 5% are being monitored and advice to schools to help them meet requirements is likely to decrease with fewer PE resources at the CDE.</p> <p>New legislation - SB 601 – requires 8 PE related items to be monitored and reported annually by CDE, with data available on the website. It is unclear whether this can be implemented by CDE with reduced staffing.</p>
<i>Benefits (health/education/ disparities):</i>	<p>Monitoring ensures legislation is being implemented.</p> <p>Provides data to hold CDE accountable for enforcing legislation.</p> <p>Provides data to show progress in implementation of standards that can be tied to improvements in PE outcomes, e.g. FITNESSGRAMS.</p> <p>Identifies schools in need of additional support.</p> <p>Provides mechanism for delivering feedback to schools to improve PE quality and quantity.</p> <p>Identifies barriers to implementation that can be addressed.</p> <p>May identify need for funding to implement legislation effectively.</p>
<i>Evidence:</i>	<p>Reluctance by CDE to make records available reduces transparency of monitoring and undermines accountability.</p>
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	<p>Move responsibility for PE accountability from state to district, because this would improve local capacity to ensure quality PE.</p> <p>Strive for independent assessment, rather than by school/district personnel.</p> <p>Provide simple tools to monitor PE, e.g. online forms, pedometer loans, SOFIT training.</p> <p>Educate parents/communities to hold schools and school boards accountable for meeting PE standards.</p>

	<p>Consider lawsuit to ensure enforcement of legislation.</p> <p>Implement pilot program of local monitoring, focusing on low-resource schools.</p> <p>Develop protocol for remedial action and additional support when requirements are not being met.</p> <p>Meeting of PE requirements should be incorporated into school websites and accountability report cards.</p> <p>Require schools to present evidence of quality PE program for all students before money is allowed to be spent on athletic programs.</p> <p>Include PE in school accreditation process and awards programs.</p> <p>Require PE grades as part of university admissions requirements.</p>
<i>Relevant research:</i>	<p>A comparative assessment of different strategies for improving monitoring and accountability systems on meeting PE requirement. Both costs and outcomes on PE quantity and quality should be assessed.</p> <p>Examine impact of meeting requirements on academic achievement, obesity, and total physical activity.</p>
<i>Costs:</i>	<p>Salaries of additional district or CDE staff to meet monitoring requirements.</p> <p>Local costs could be small if volunteers are recruited to objectively monitor classes, e.g., through PTAs, but issue of volunteers working in schools and monitoring legal requirements may be controversial.</p>
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	<p>Legislators, CDE, CAHPERD, CDPH, CSBA, Schools/Principals, Parents</p>
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<p><i>“Legislation to improve PE and prevent obesity in CA not enforced”. “Improving PE”. “Ensuring California PE is up standards.”</i></p>

LEVEL 1	MVPA
<i>Policy:</i>	<p>TEACHER TRAINING/STAFF DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Elementary school teachers need training in PE instruction.</p> <p>Middle & high school teachers need continuing education to ensure PE remains active and current.</p> <p>Teachers at all levels require training in new content standards and MVPA goals.</p> <p>Training in evidence based PE programs is desired.</p>
<i>Current status:</i>	<p>CDE Task Force recommends credentialed PE specialists at all levels, but 85% of elementary PE classes are taught by teachers with no PE training.</p> <p>A PE course is not required for elementary teachers.</p> <p>Content standards training is being disseminated slowly and unsystematically (5 levels of training recommended)</p> <p>Funding to hire PE specialists for grades K-8 under threat with 2009 budget crisis. Even if funding proposed in 2008 is delivered, it only covers half of salary, only 16% of schools will receive funds, and funding is not awarded based on need.</p>
<i>Benefits (health/education/ disparities):</i>	<p>Training ensures teachers are qualified to deliver PE that meets content standards, PE minutes requirements, and 50% MVPA.</p>
<i>Evidence:</i>	<p>Certified PE teachers provide better (e.g., more active, better sports skills) PE than classroom teachers.</p> <p>Professional development & ongoing support improve elementary school PE classes and improvements are maintained for years.</p> <p>California administrators consider teacher training most important factor for achieving quality PE.</p> <p>Lowest FITNESSGRAM scores in schools without trained PE teachers.</p> <p>Schools without trained PE teachers less likely to meet PE minute requirements.</p>
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	<p>Require continuing education for all teachers who instruct PE.</p> <p>Require PE units for elementary school teacher certification.</p> <p>Increase funding for PE continuing education and require needs-</p>

	<p>based allocations. Funding could be shared by CDE and CDPH because benefits of training are relevant to both departments.</p> <p>Provide funding and support for training in evidence-based PE programs like CATCH, SPARK etc.</p> <p>Require training in obesity prevention for teachers, principals, school boards and other administrators. Training could take the form of a webinar.</p>
<i>Relevant research:</i>	<p>Monitor dissemination and outcomes of content standards training.</p> <p>Monitor improvements in PE quality and quantity and student FITNESSGRAM results to compare various models of teacher training.</p> <p>Can costs of training be reduced and feasibility improved with webinars and online training?</p>
<i>Costs:</i>	<p>To provide 157,339 elementary school teachers in CA with a 3 unit PE course (\$1017 at full CSU tuition) would cost \$160,013,763.</p> <p>To train all PE teachers K-12 in a program like SPARK or CATCH would cost around \$20,000,000 with additional costs to provide substitute teachers during the training.</p> <p>An example content-standards based curriculum would cost about \$40,000,000 to implement K-12, including training.</p>
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	<p>PE teachers, principals, CDE, CSBA, CDPH, ACSA, companies providing training modules</p>
<i>Barriers:</i>	<p>Cost.</p> <p>Lack of training programs oriented to achieving content standards, PE minutes, and 50% MVPA goals.</p>
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<p><i>“PE is not just throwing the ball out” “PE teachers need unique skills to manage a classroom without walls and moving targets”</i></p> <p><i>“Prepare teachers for 21st century PE”</i></p>

LEVEL 1	MVPA/VPE
<i>Policy:</i>	REQUIRED PE COURSE FOR TEACHER CREDENTIALING Require 3 unit PE course for university students who are planning to become teachers
<i>Current status:</i>	Elementary school classroom teachers receive little or no training in PE but most are required to instruct PE classes. PE is a difficult subject to teach and requires special skills.
<i>Benefits (health/education/ disparities):</i>	Qualified PE teachers more likely to provide active and high quality PE. Increases value of PE in teacher's eyes.
<i>Evidence:</i>	Generalist teachers in elementary school who received PE staff development improved the quantity and quality of their PE instruction.
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	Mandate 3 unit PE course for teacher credentialing in CA universities. The course should have the goal of preparing them to teach PE that meets state requirements (as opposed to teaching only PE theory and concepts) and includes 50% MVPA. Ensure universities have capacity to deliver PE training.
<i>Relevant research:</i>	Evaluate and compare various approaches to the PE course on teacher performance in PE and student outcomes.
<i>Costs:</i>	3 unit PE course \$1017 at full CSU tuition
<i>Barriers:</i>	Costs to teachers-in-training and universities. Opposition to an additional requirement for certification. Need to develop courses and capacity to deliver them to large numbers of undergraduates. New required course does not affect already-certified teachers.
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	All teachers, teachers' unions, CA universities with education majors, CDE, CDPH, legislature.
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<i>"Preparing teachers to meet all of students' educational needs"</i>

LEVEL 2	MVPA
<i>Policy:</i>	<p>INSTITUTIONALIZE EDUCATION-PUBLIC HEALTH COOPERATION</p> <p>CDE has the responsibility for implementing PE requirements, but quality PE has benefits for CDPH as well. Improving institutional cooperation could broaden the consensus about PE goals and bring more resources to support achieving those goals.</p>
<i>Current status:</i>	<p>The obesity epidemic and physical inactivity of youth are high priorities for the CDPH.</p> <p>Schools & PE classes are a critical setting for obesity prevention and physical activity promotion.</p> <p>Healthy People 2010 has health objectives for PE (i.e., 50% MVPA) that have not been adopted by CDE.</p> <p>CDE may not view PE, physical activity or obesity as a priority.</p> <p>CDPH cannot implement obesity related policies in schools without collaboration of CDE</p>
<i>Benefits (health/education/ disparities):</i>	<p>Combining resources and speaking with one voice can generate more support for quality PE with the legislature and the general public.</p> <p>CDE and CDPH can jointly plan strategies to improve PE to meet mutual goals and both provide financial and personnel resources.</p>
<i>Evidence:</i>	<p>Project LEAN learned from CA School Boards Association how to reach schools, starting with providing technical assistance to districts.</p> <p>The CA After School Project is an example of a collaborative effort of CDE and CDPH.</p>
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	<p>Collaborate on pilot programs.</p> <p>Legislative incentives or requirements for collaboration.</p> <p>Identify liaisons at each Department, both state and regional. (This could be a responsibility of the 11 CDPH PA specialists distributed in LHDs and universities throughout the state.)</p> <p>External partners (e.g., CA Endowment) help facilitate dialogue between CDE and CDPH.</p> <p>Follow project LEAN model to develop grassroots support.</p>

	<p>PE teachers must be encouraged to support physical activity and health goals as these will help their subject to be valued more.</p> <p>Obesity prevention training for teachers, principals, and school administrators.</p>
<i>Relevant research:</i>	Study other states or cities (e.g. New York City) with health-related PE curricula.
<i>Costs:</i>	<p>Advocacy and communication efforts</p> <p>Joint workshops</p> <p>Personnel time</p> <p>Political capital</p>
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	State Superintendent, CDE, CDPH, Site administrators, LHDs, local school districts, associations of school boards and health officers, e.g., CCLHO, CSBA
<i>Barriers:</i>	<p>Communication is often loaded, attributing blame to one side or the other.</p> <p>PE teachers are trying to do their best and resent additional health goals.</p> <p>School administrators do not see child's health as their charge.</p>
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<p><i>"Healthy kids are better learners" "PE meets education and health goals" "PE: An education and health priority" "Education and Public Health Work Together for Children's Health"</i></p> <p><i>"Fit kids test better"</i></p>

LEVEL 2	MVPA/VPE
Policy:	PE CLASS SIZE Require PE classes to be equal in size with other academic subjects.
Current status:	CA has the largest PE class sizes in the country. There is no mandate on class sizes for PE in CA. Other subjects have smaller class sizes, although these classes may be easier to manage than a PE class. Budget cuts in 2008/2009 are likely to result in fewer PE teachers and larger class sizes. Other subjects (e.g. math & reading) put children into PE to reduce the number of children in these classes.
Benefits (health/education/ disparities):	Smaller class sizes mean teachers can spend time on skills instruction and activity, not on discipline and record keeping. Smaller class sizes mean children are more likely to have enough equipment to practice with. Children are more active in smaller class sizes.
Evidence:	Higher class size is related to poorer quality PE and lower physical activity levels. Class sizes are highest in high school. Class sizes are higher in low-resource schools.
Potential policy steps:	Adopt NASPE recommendation of 25:1 for PE class size, with a maximum class size of 4. Enforce class size with funded mandate and monitoring. Hire teaching assistants to support PE teachers in larger classes. Encourage principals to value PE and support reduced class sizes for PE. CA School Boards Association should re-evaluate their contract language and district policy allowing “budget crises” to over-rule class size contracts of 50 students in PE. Award funding to schools with largest PE class sizes.
Relevant research:	Randomized controlled trial of reduced class size vs normal size, measuring improvements in PE quality, % time in MVPA, and academic achievement.

	<p>Compare costs and outcomes of reducing class size through hiring more PE specialists versus aides.</p> <p>Case studies of teachers dealing with large classes.</p>
<i>Costs:</i>	<p>Additional PE teachers would be needed costing approximately \$180,000,000 per year. (Based on 2007 estimates before proposed budget cuts and reduction in number of PE teachers).</p>
<i>Barriers:</i>	<p>Class sizes are a contractual issue with unions.</p> <p>Other subject teachers are unlikely to vote for more PE time or staff need for smaller class sizes if this means lower pay increases or losing health benefits.</p>
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	<p>All teachers, teacher's unions, CSBA, CDE, CDPH</p>
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<p><i>“Obesity prevention not possible because PE classes are too large”</i></p> <p><i>“Large classes contribute to unfit and obese children”</i></p> <p><i>“Equal class size for all subjects”</i></p>

LEVEL 2	VPE
Policy:	EXEMPTIONS FROM PE Stop all exemptions from PE in all grades.
Current status:	Exemptions from PE in grades 10-12 are common. Reasons for exemptions include activities that do not support physical activity such as driver's education, band, JROTC, etc. Exemptions from PE further diminish the value placed on PE. Current legislation is under discussion whether to disallow all exemptions or allow active exemptions.
Benefits (health/education/ disparities):	PE will be a compulsory subject with equal standing to other academic subjects. More students will participate in PE and physical activity.
Evidence:	Students who do not take PE are less active during the school day and have fewer opportunities to develop skills and knowledge.
Potential policy steps:	Adopt legislation to disallow PE exemptions except for medical contraindications. Medical excuses should be temporary.
Relevant research:	Examine the prevalence and reasons for PE exemptions to estimate the impact of a prohibition.
Costs:	Increased class size or need for more PE teachers.
Barriers:	Cost of adding students to PE classes. Opposition from athletic departments, band, driver's education, cheerleading, and other groups that commonly obtain exemptions. There some exemption activities could be equally or more active then PE, so there is a risk of reducing students' activity levels if these exemptions are disallowed. This will have to be weighed against the issue that any exemption threatens the academic standing of PE and removes students from the opportunities to learn skills and knowledge that are unique to PE.
Stakeholders:	PE teachers, principals, CSBA, CDE, CDPH.
Campaign focus:	<i>"Every student needs PE" "No exemptions from PE; no exemptions from healthy lifestyles" "Every student should be physically educated"</i>

LEVEL 2	MVPA
<i>Policy:</i>	ONLY PE SPECIALISTS TEACH PE Certified PE specialists teach PE at all levels, preK-12.
<i>Current status:</i>	85% of elementary PE is not taught by PE specialists. One PE teacher per elementary school is not sufficient, because these specialists usually see students once per week. Unknown number of generalist teachers instruct PE in middle schools.
<i>Benefits (health/education/ disparities):</i>	PE specialists can ensure high quality PE.
<i>Evidence:</i>	Research has shown that PE quality and quantity is higher when PE is taught by certified specialists.
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	Require that only certified PE specialists instruct PE, and provide funds to hire sufficient PE specialists.
<i>Relevant research:</i>	Impact of additional PE specialists on quality & quantity of PE, FITNESSGRAM and student academic achievement
<i>Costs:</i>	Expensive, but specific estimates not made.
<i>Barriers:</i>	Cost
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	PE teachers, principals, CSBA, CDE, CDPH
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	“PE specialists are best” “No one knows PE like PE specialists”

LEVEL 2	VPE
Policy:	DISTRICT PE COORDINATORS Hire PE coordinators at each district office
Current status:	We are only aware of 16 district PE coordinators in CA, out of 1086 districts.
Benefits (health/education/ disparities):	District PE coordinators can provide a voice and expertise on PE that is otherwise absent. District PE coordinators can provide support to CDE to implement legislative goals and conduct monitoring of PE requirements. District PE coordinators can provide support for grant writing and seeking funding for school PE programs. District PE coordinators can guide schools on wellness policies and evaluation.
Evidence:	Case studies indicate that district PE coordinators provide critical support to improve PE in low resource schools.
Potential policy steps:	Legislation to mandate district PE coordinators and identify funding mechanisms. Full time coordinators are not needed, except in the largest districts. Identification of likely candidates, training of potential candidates if qualified staff do not currently exist.
Relevant research:	Evaluate the impact of hiring district PE coordinators on quality, quantity, and disparities in PE.
Costs:	While there are 1000 districts in CA, they vary in size. To have a district PE coordinator for every 50 schools would involve hiring 163 coordinators at a salary rate of \$96,000, an estimated total of \$15,648,000 every year.
Barriers:	Cost Availability of qualified candidates. Need for training and support. Administrative arrangements to share PE coordinators across several smaller districts.
Stakeholders:	CDE, Counties & school districts, Funding bodies, Program suppliers
Campaign focus:	<i>“Local support is needed to meet state goals”</i>

LEVEL 2	VPE
<i>Policy:</i>	PE CURRICULUM EVALUATION A program to evaluate PE curricula would make it easier for districts, schools, and teachers to select curricula that are consistent with state requirements. A central resource to house example curricula.
<i>Current status:</i>	PE is one of just a few subjects with no process for curriculum approval. There is no curriculum for the content standards and teachers are all developing their own, leading to duplication of effort. PE curricula like SPARK and CATCH have been evaluated, but content standards curricula have not been assessed.
<i>Benefits (health/education/disparities):</i>	A curriculum evaluation process could help improve quality of PE classes and achievement of CDE PE goals. Improved status of PE within CDE, school districts, and CSBA.
<i>Evidence:</i>	There are evidence-based PE curricula that have been evaluated for their ability to meet health goals and contribute to academic achievement.
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	CDE can develop a policy for PE curriculum evaluation and approval modeled after other subject areas. The legislature could mandate CDE to evaluate and approve PE curricula and collaborate with CDPH on this process. Consensus process, including consideration of evidence, to develop criteria for evaluating and approving PE curricula.
<i>Relevant research:</i>	Evaluate schools that adopt various approved curricula (and no curricula) to compare the impact on meeting PE requirements.
<i>Costs:</i>	Modest, but not estimated.
<i>Barriers:</i>	Low status of PE within CDE. Lack of legislative mandate.
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	PE teachers, CAHPERD, CSBA, CDE, CDPH, legislature.
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<i>“Quality PE requires quality curricula”</i>

LEVEL 3	MVPA/VPE
<i>Policy:</i>	INCREASE REQUIRED PE MINUTES Increase PE minutes to 300 per week at the elementary level. Increase PE minutes to 450 per week at the secondary level.
<i>Current status:</i>	Required PE minutes in CA are 100 and 200 per week in elementary and secondary schools, respectively (officially 200 and 400 every 10 school days). These requirements are not being met in elementary schools.
<i>Benefits (health/education/disparities):</i>	Increasing PE minutes will provide more opportunities for learning skills and knowledge, increase time spent in MVPA, and contribute to obesity prevention.
<i>Evidence:</i>	NASPE recommends 300 and 400 weekly minutes of PE in elementary and secondary schools, respectively.
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	Legislation to increase PE time. Identify funding to cover costs of the increase.
<i>Relevant research:</i>	Cost estimates are needed to implement this increase.
<i>Costs:</i>	Not estimated, but additional PE specialists and perhaps additional facilities and equipment will be required.
<i>Barriers:</i>	To achieve this would require either reducing time in other academic subject or increasing length of school day. Unless PE classes are active and high quality, increasing required minutes will have little impact. Elementary schools are not able to meet current requirements, so additional funding and support will be needed to achieve increased minutes.
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	PE teachers, teacher's unions, principals, CSBA, school administrators, legislature, CDE, CDPH.
<i>Campaign focus:</i>	<i>"More PE is more learning and more calories burned" "PE is getting short-changed"</i>

LEVEL 3	VPE
Policy:	PE IN ALL GRADES Require PE in all grades K-12.
Current status:	Students are not required to attend PE in grades 11 & 12.
Benefits (health/education/ disparities):	Adolescence is the age of most rapid decline in physical activity. Maintaining PE in grades 11 & 12 is important to keep their activity levels at recommended levels and prepare them for the transition to personal responsibility for physical activity in adulthood.
Evidence:	PE contributes to daily physical activity, but the impact of quality PE on later physical activity and health is not known.
Potential policy steps:	Amend legislation to mandate PE in all grades. Provide funding for additional PE teachers, facilities, and equipment. Encourage parents to request PE for their children at all ages. Include PE in GPA and university admissions. May need to amend high school graduation requirements and university entry requirements to accommodate additional years of PE.
Costs:	Additional staff to cover two additional years of PE at high school level. Based on a salary of \$74,000 (equivalent to a substitute teacher's hourly wage) the total cost in California to improve the PE teacher: student ratio and allow all high school students to participate would be \$174,788,000 per year.
Barriers:	Cost. Need for additional facilities and equipment. Potential impact on high school graduation and university entry requirements.
Stakeholders:	All teachers, school administrators, CSBA, legislature, CDE, CDPH
Campaign focus:	<i>"PE is important for all ages" "PE in all grades is the right thing to do" "Students need PE in all grades to prepare them to lead active and healthy lives"</i>

LEVEL 3	VPE
<i>Policy:</i>	FITNESS TESTING IN ALL GRADES Require annual FITNESSGRAMS for all students with results included in measures of school and academic performance.
<i>Current status:</i>	FITNESSGRAMS are required in grades 5, 7 and 9 every other year. Lowest FITNESSGRAM scores in schools without trained PE teachers.
<i>Benefits (health/education/ disparities):</i>	Annual FITNESSGRAMS will allow closer monitoring of student progress. Annual FITNESSGRAMS will provide accountability for PE programs and match other subject testing which occurs annually. Helps student set goals for following year. These assessments can be used to evaluate the impact of PE reforms.
<i>Potential policy steps:</i>	Adopt legislation to require annual FITNESSGRAMS in all grades. Provide support for staff to conduct good quality annual tests; e.g. training or assistance from university students Require CDE to present results for each school and each district on its website. Adopt a policy of sending a summary of results home to parents with recommendations for improvement.
<i>Relevant research:</i>	Evaluate quality of FITNESSGRAM implementation and the impact of training and support programs. What are implications of including PE grades in API and AYP?
<i>Costs:</i>	Not estimated. Could be shared with CDPH.
<i>Barriers:</i>	Cost of managing the data and sending results to parents. Time out of curriculum for testing. “Teaching to the test” may be increased. Application of test scores and protocols to younger children.
<i>Stakeholders:</i>	PE teachers, principals, administrators, students, parents, CDE, CDPH

Campaign focus:

“Annual PE tests are important for students” “All students need annual fitness tests” “Fitness test feedback benefits all students and schools”